|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |
|---|--|---|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary  | 10/633,669   | SHIMAZAWA ET AL.  |
|   | Examiner   | Art Unit  |
|   | Kevin M. Bernatz   | 1773  |
| All Participants:   | Status of Application  | : <u>allowed</u>  |
| (1) Kevin M. Bernatz.   | (3)  |   |
| (2) <u>Julie Seaman</u> .   | (4)  |   |
| Date of Interview: 28 October 2005  | Time: <u>AM</u>  |   |
| Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ If Yes, provide a brief description:   | Applicant's representative)<br>o                                   |   |
| Part I.   |  |   |
| Rejection(s) discussed: N/A   |  |   |
| Claims discussed: 9,11  |  |   |
| Prior art documents discussed: N/A  |  |   |
| Part II.  |  | ·   |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE Examiner indicated that claims 9 and 11 were duplicates agreed to cancel claim 11 and have the case pass to iss   | , but that the rest of the case was in                             |   |
| Part III.   |  |   |
| <ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sequirectly resulted in the allowance of the applicat of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sequirectly in the Notice of Allowability.</li> </ul> | ion. The examiner will provide a parate record of the substance of | written summary of the substance f the interview, since the interview |
| did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief s   | summary by the examiner appears                                    | s in Part II above.   |
|   |  |   |
|   |  |   |
|   |  | •   |
| Kevin M. Bernatz, PhD   |  |   |
| Primary Examiner  |  | -   |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Apr   | pplicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)    |   |